

A KHINTCHINE-TYPE THEOREM FOR HYPERPLANES

ANISH GHOSH

ABSTRACT. We obtain the convergence case of a Khintchine type theorem for a large class of hyperplanes. Our approach to the problem is from a dynamical viewpoint, and we modify a method due to Kleinbock and Margulis to prove the result.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to prove the convergence case of a Khintchine type theorem for hyperplanes. Let us first introduce some notation, and recall terminology from the theory of metric Diophantine approximation. Vectors will be denoted in boldface, i.e $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, further we will denote the vector $(1, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ by $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. Let $M_{n,1}$ denote the set of matrices with n rows, 1 column, and real entries. For $v > 0$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the set $\mathcal{W}_v(n, 1)$ to be the set of all matrices $A = (\alpha_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} \in M_{n,1}$ for which there are infinitely many $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\max_i |p_i + \alpha_i q| < |q|^{-v}$$

for some $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. We further define the sets :

Definition 1.1.

$$\mathcal{W}_v^+(n, 1) = \bigcup_{u > v} \mathcal{W}_u(n, 1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{W}_v^-(n, 1) = \bigcap_{u < v} \mathcal{W}_u(n, 1).$$

Note that from Definition 1.1, it follows that, $v_1 \leq v_2 \Rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{v_2}(n, 1) \subset \mathcal{W}_{v_1}(n, 1)$.

Definition 1.2. For $A \in M_{n,1}$, denote by $\mathcal{M}_A$, the hyperplane

$$\mathcal{M}_A = \{(\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}A) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\}.$$

¹Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 11J83, Secondary 11K60

Definition 1.3. For a submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}, \psi)$, the set:

$$\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{M} \mid |p + \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{q}| < \psi(\|\mathbf{q}\|) \text{ for infinitely many } \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \text{ and some } p \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Here, $\|\mathbf{q}\| = \max\{|q_1|, \dots, |q_n|\}$ is the height of the vector $\mathbf{q}$. Estimating the (induced) measure and Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}, \psi)$ has been a major theme in the theory of Diophantine approximation. We now state the classical Khintchine theorem, one of the first results along these lines.

Theorem 1.4. Let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any function. Then $|\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^n, \psi)| = 0$ whenever $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{n-1} \psi(k) < \infty$.

where $|\cdot|$ denotes Lebesgue measure. The above theorem is referred to as the convergence case of the Khintchine-Groshev theorem and turns out to be an immediate consequence of the Borel-Cantelli lemma. Since the Borel-Cantelli lemma works in only one direction, the complementary divergence case is more difficult and needs deeper ideas from Diophantine approximation and ergodic theory. In fact, the divergence case also needs restrictions on the function ψ in the case $n = 1$. Classical results in this theory are due to A.Khintchine, A.Groshev and W.Schmidt, among others. For more details on the history of the theorem and the classical convergence and divergence case, we direct the reader to [S], [H] and [D1].

We now turn to the theory of metric Diophantine approximation on manifolds. The idea is to ask questions of Khintchine-Groshev type while restricting to submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^n$. This turns out to be more difficult, and needs more sophisticated techniques even for the convergence case. For classical results and techniques in the theory of metric Diophantine approximation, we refer the reader to [BD] and [H].

Our approach to the problem is from a dynamical point of view. In [KM], D.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis have developed a technique which relates Diophantine questions on manifolds to quantitative non-divergence of unipotent trajectories on $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$. This allowed them to settle a long standing conjecture of Sprindzhuk. Subsequently, in [BKM], the authors modify these techniques to prove the convergence case of a Khintchine-type result for non-degenerate submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Further, in [K], D.Kleinbock shows that Diophantine properties of affine subspaces are inherited by their non-degenerate submanifolds.

We will use a modification of this method to establish a convergence Khintchine theorem for affine hyperplanes.

Let us mention an important special case of the Khintchine set-up. A

submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called extremal if the set $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}, \psi_\epsilon)$ has measure 0 for every $\epsilon > 0$ where $\psi_\epsilon(k) = k^{-(n+\epsilon)}$. [Note : If a point is ψ_ϵ -approximable for some $\epsilon > 0$, it is referred to as Very Well Approximable.] Criteria for extremality of subspaces were examined in detail in [K]. There, the following necessary and sufficient condition for the extremality of hyperplane was laid out:

Theorem 1.5. [K] $\mathcal{M}_A$ is extremal if and only if

$$A \notin \mathcal{W}_n^+(n, 1).$$

In [BBKM](§6.5, problem 5), the authors pose the problem of finding criteria for affine subspaces to satisfy a Khintchine theorem for convergence and divergence. This question was also part of a more specific list of conjectures in [K](§6.3). In this paper, we provide a partial answer by providing sufficient conditions under which a hyperplane satisfies the convergence part of Khintchine's theorem. Specifically, we will consider hyperplanes $\mathcal{M}_A$ where the matrix A satisfies the condition :

$$(1.1) \quad A \notin \mathcal{W}_n^-(n, 1).$$

Note that $\mathcal{W}_n^+(n, 1) \subseteq \mathcal{W}_n^-(n, 1)$. Consequently, we are looking at the complement of a larger set of matrices. Let us now state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.6. Let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a non-increasing function, and assume that $A \notin \mathcal{W}_n^-(n, 1)$. Then,

$$|\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_A, \psi)| = 0$$

whenever $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{n-1}\psi(k) < \infty$.

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the volume measure on M .

Thus, in terminology borrowed from [BD] if A satisfies (1.1), $\mathcal{M}_A$ is a Groshev-type manifold for convergence.

It is instructive to compare the condition in Theorem 1.5, with that in (1.1). From Definition 1.1 and the remark immediately after, it follows that if A does not satisfy (1.1), then $\mathcal{M}_A$ belongs to the null set of non-extremal hyperplanes. The Hausdorff dimension of this set has been computed in [D2], and is equal to 1. Thus, Theorem 1.6 applies to a very large class of hyperplanes.

Note that the set $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}, \psi)$ could be quite large, even though it has measure zero. In case we take ψ to be a decreasing function, Dickinson and Dodson have proved the following theorem :

Theorem 1.7. [DD] *Let M be an m -dimensional extremal C^1 manifold embedded in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be decreasing with the lower order of $\frac{1}{\psi}$ denoted by $\lambda(\psi)$. Then for $\lambda(\psi) \geq n$,*

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}, \psi) \geq m - 1 + \frac{n + 1}{\lambda(\psi) + 1}$$

where $\dim$ denotes Hausdorff dimension and the lower order of ψ is defined as $\lambda(\psi) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \psi(n)}{\log(n)}$.

For example, if we choose a A as in (1.1) and for $k \geq 2$, let $\psi(k) = \frac{1}{k^n (\log k)^{1+\epsilon}}$, then Theorem 1.6 combined with the above result tells us that $\dim(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_A, \psi)) = n - 1$.

We do not examine the complementary divergence case here, although we do think it should be true. More precisely, we make the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.8. *Let A satisfy (1.1), and $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a non-increasing function. Then,*

$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}_A, \psi)$ has full measure whenever $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{n-1} \psi(k) = \infty$.

The divergence case has been proved in [BBDD] for straight lines passing through the origin.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state definitions and reduce the result to two Theorems. Section's 3 and 4 deal with these Theorems and complete the proof.

2. REDUCTION TO BOREL-CANTELLI

In what follows, $||$ will denote both the Lebesgue measure of a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, as well as the absolute value of a real number. The context will hopefully make the usage clear.

Fix an open ball $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, a function $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and a matrix $A = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})^t \in M_{n,1}$.

Definition 2.1. $M^<(B, t, \psi) = \{\mathbf{x} \in B \mid \exists p \in \mathbb{Z}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \text{ such that}$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} |p + \mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}A)| < \psi(2^t); \\ |q_i + \alpha_i q_n| < 1 \ \forall \ 1 \leq i \leq n-1; \\ 2^t \leq \|\mathbf{q}\| < 2^{t+1}. \end{array} \right\}.$$

In a completely analogous fashion, we can define :

Definition 2.2. $M^{\geq}(B, t, \psi) = \{\mathbf{x} \in B \mid \exists p \in \mathbb{Z}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \text{ such that}$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} |p + \mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}A)| < \psi(2^t); \\ |q_i + \alpha_i q_n| \geq 1 \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq n-1; \\ 2^t \leq \|\mathbf{q}\| < 2^{t+1}. \end{array} \right\}.$$

By the Borel-Cantelli Lemma, it is enough to demonstrate :

Claim 2.3. $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |M^{\geq}(B, t, \psi)| < \infty$.

and

Claim 2.4. $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |M^{<}(B, t, \psi)| < \infty$.

Claim 2.3 turns out to be straightforward, and we provide a proof in the next section. Claim 2.4 however is more involved, as one would expect and we devote the rest of the paper to establishing it.

3. ESTABLISHING CLAIM 2.3

To prove Claim 2.3, we will establish :

Theorem 3.1. $|M^{\geq}(B, t, \psi)| < C(n, B)\psi(2^t)2^{nt}$.
where $C(n, B)$ is a constant depending on n and B .

That the above theorem implies 2.3 is immediate because

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |M^{\geq}(B, t, \psi)| \leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \psi(2^t)2^{nt} \asymp \int_0^{\infty} x^{n-1}\psi(x)dx \asymp \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k^{n-1}\psi(k) < \infty.$$

To prove theorem 3.1, we will prove :

Lemma 3.2. For fixed $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying:

- (1) $|q_i + \alpha_i q_n| \geq 1$ for some i and
- (2) $2^t \leq \|\mathbf{q}\| < 2^{t+1}$.

and for an arbitrary (fixed) $\theta > 0$, the set:

$\hat{M}(B, \mathbf{q}, \theta) = \{\mathbf{x} \in B \mid |p + \mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \cdot A)| < \theta \text{ for some } p \in \mathbb{Z}\}$
has measure at most $C(n, B)\theta$.

Clearly Lemma 3.2 implies Theorem 3.1 because

$$|M^{\geq}(B, t, \psi)| = \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n, 2^t \leq \|\mathbf{q}\| < 2^{t+1}} |\hat{M}(B, \mathbf{q}, \psi(2^t))| \leq 2^{n+1}C(n, B)\psi(2^t)2^{nt}.$$

And so, it remains to provide the following

Proof. Let $S = \sqrt{|q_1 + \alpha_1 q_n|^2 + \cdots + |q_{n-1} + \alpha_{n-1} q_n|^2}$. Then $\hat{M}(B, \mathbf{q}, \theta)$ is the union of “strips” each of which have volume at most $C \frac{\theta}{S} (\text{diam} B)^{n-1}$ for some constant C , depending on n . Also, the number of such “strips” is

at most $S \cdot \text{diam}(B) + 1$.

Therefore, $|\hat{M}(B, \mathbf{q}, \theta)|$ is at most $C \frac{\theta}{S} (\text{diam} B)^{n-1} \times (S \cdot (\text{diam} B) + 1)$. From Definition 2.2, we have $S^{-1} \leq 1$ and this implies that

$$|\hat{M}(B, \mathbf{q}, \theta)| < \theta((\text{diam} B)^n + (\text{diam} B)^{n-1}) < \theta C(n, B)$$

for a constant $C(n, B)$ as claimed. $\square$

This concludes the easier half of the proof. Note that this method is completely general and the hyperplane can in fact be replaced by any affine subspace. A similar situation arises while dealing with non-degenerate manifolds as well. See [BKM] for details.

4. QUANTITATIVE NON-DIVERGENCE

To demonstrate Claim 2.4, we use a variation of a method used in [BKM] and originally due to D.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis, (see [KM]). The method consists of translating the problem of estimating the measure of $M^<(B, t, \psi)$ to an estimate on non-divergence of lattice-trajectories in Euclidean space. This section is devoted to setting notation and stating a theorem which reduces Claim 2.4 to an estimate from [BKM].

Definition 4.1. Let C and α be positive numbers and V be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. A function $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be (C, α) – good on V if for any open ball $B \subseteq V$, and for any $\epsilon > 0$, one has :

$$\left| \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in B \mid |f(\mathbf{x})| < \epsilon \cdot \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \{|f(\mathbf{x})|\} \right\} \right| \leq C \epsilon^\alpha |B|.$$

Some easy properties of (C, α) – good functions are :

(1) f is (C, α) – good on $V \Rightarrow$ so is $\lambda f \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

(2) $f_i \ i \in I$ are (C, α) – good $\Rightarrow$ so is $\sup_{i \in I} |f_i|$.

This paper deals with hyperplanes, which are parametrized by linear functions. Consequently, the following lemma will be useful.

Lemma 4.2. Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and f be a (continuous) linear function on V . Then f is $(C_d, 1)$ – good on V , where $C_d = \frac{2^{d+2}}{v_d}$, and v_d is the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. Let $B \subseteq V$ be a d dimensional cube, i.e. a product of d open intervals B_i , all of the same size. Let b denote the side-length of B . The set $\{\mathbf{x} \in B \mid |f(\mathbf{x})| < \epsilon\}$ is a strip of width at most $2 \frac{\epsilon b}{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} |f(\mathbf{x})|}$.

The volume of the strip therefore, is at most $2 \frac{\epsilon b}{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} |f(\mathbf{x})|} \cdot 2b^{d-1} = 4 \frac{\epsilon b^d}{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} |f(\mathbf{x})|} = 4 \frac{\epsilon |B|}{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} |f(\mathbf{x})|}$. To complete the proof, we circumscribe open balls with cubes which are still contained in V . $\square$

For more examples of $(C, \alpha) - \text{good}$ functions, see [KM].

Let Λ be a discrete subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^k$. A subgroup Γ of Λ is said to be primitive in Λ if $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \Lambda$. Let $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$ be the set of all nonzero primitive subgroups of Λ .

We need to “measure” discrete subgroups of $\mathbb{R}^l$. Let $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^l$ be one such subgroup. Denote by $\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}$, the minimal linear subspace of $\mathbb{R}^l$ containing Γ . If $k = \dim(\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}})$, for any basis $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$ of Γ the vector $\mathbf{v}_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{v}_k \in \bigwedge^k(\mathbb{R}^l)$ is (up to a sign) independent of the basis. It is therefore natural to define $\|\Gamma\| = \|\mathbf{w}\|$ where $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{v}_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{v}_k$ is said to represent Γ .

The norm above is the extended norm. More precisely, for $I = (i_1, \dots, i_j) \subset \{1, \dots, l\}$, $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_j$, let

$$e_I = e_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{i_j} \in \bigwedge^j(\mathbb{R}^l)$$

Then, for

$$\mathbf{w} = \sum_{I \subset \{1, \dots, l\}} \mathbf{w}_I e_I,$$

we define $\|\mathbf{w}\| = \max_{I \subset \{1, \dots, k\}} |\mathbf{w}_I|$ with the additional convention that $e_{\emptyset} = 1$.

Let $\psi_0(x) = x^{-n}$. Then, from the monotonicity of ψ and the condition in Theorem 1.6, it follows that there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x > x_0 \Rightarrow \psi(x) < \psi_0(x)$. Hence, $M^<(B, t, \psi) \subseteq M^<(B, t, \psi_0)$, for sufficiently large t . Therefore, Claim 2.4 will follow if we are able to obtain an estimate on $M^<(B, t, \psi_0)$. And so we can henceforth assume without any loss of generality, that $\psi(x) = \psi_0(x)$.

For $0 < \epsilon < 1$, let

$$D(\epsilon, t) = \text{diag}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2^{-nt}}, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{2^t}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{2^t}\right)$$

i.e. $D(\epsilon, t)$ is an element of $\text{GL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ and has n factors of the type $\frac{\epsilon}{2^t}$. Thus, $D(\epsilon, t)$ when applied to a vector expands the first component and contracts the remaining.

In what follows, $\tilde{A} \in M_{n-1,1}$ will denote the matrix $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})^t$. Also, I_k will stand for the identity $k \times k$ square matrix, and 0 will stand for the zero matrix of appropriate dimension.

Let $u_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathrm{GL}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ denote the (unipotent) matrix :

$$u_{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \mathbf{x} & \tilde{\mathbf{x}}A \\ 0 & I_{n-1} & I_{n-1} & \tilde{A} \\ 0 & 0 & I_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Definition 4.3. Let Λ denote the subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}^{2n}$ consisting of vectors of the form

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} p \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ \mathbf{q}^t \end{pmatrix} \mid p \in \mathbb{Z}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \right\}$$

Let $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then $u_{\mathbf{x}}\lambda$ is the vector whose components appear in the definition of $M^<(B, t, \psi)$. Therefore, existence of a non-zero $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}$ satisfying the conditions enumerated in Definition 2.1 would imply the existence of a nonzero element of $u_{\mathbf{x}}\lambda$ in some parallelepiped in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Using $D(\epsilon, t)$ we can transform this parallelepiped into a cube and then use an estimate from [BKM] to find the measure of $\mathbf{x} \in B$ for which this happens. Specifically, it can be seen that $M^<(B, t, \psi)$ is a subset of

$$\{\mathbf{x} \in B \mid \|D(\epsilon, t)u_{\mathbf{x}}\lambda\| < \epsilon \text{ for some } \lambda \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

We now state a slightly modified version of Theorem 6.2 from [BKM] which provides the essential :

Theorem 4.4. [BKM] *For arbitrary $l \geq 2$, let Λ be a discrete subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^l$ of rank k . Further, let a ball $B(\mathbf{x}_0, r_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a continuous map $H : \tilde{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(W)$ be given, where $\tilde{B}$ stands for $B(\mathbf{x}_0, 3^k r_0)$. Take $C, \alpha > 0$, $0 < \rho \leq \frac{1}{k}$ and let $\|\cdot\|$ be the supremum norm on $\Lambda(\mathbb{R}^l)$ (as defined before). Assume that for any $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$,*

- (1) *the function $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \|H(\mathbf{x})\Gamma\|$ is C, α -good on $\tilde{B}$ and*
- (2) *$\exists \mathbf{x} \in B$ such that $\|H(\mathbf{x})\Gamma\| \geq \rho$.*

Then for every positive $\epsilon \leq \rho$ one has :

$$|\{\mathbf{x} \in B \mid \|H(\mathbf{x})\lambda\| < \epsilon \text{ for some } \lambda \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}\}| < k(3^d N_d)^k \cdot C\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\rho}\right)^\alpha |B|.$$

Remarks:

- (1) The fact that unipotent trajectories do not diverge dates back to the work of Margulis in the 70's. The above sharp quantitative estimate is from [BKM] and is a modification of an earlier estimate from [KM].
- (2) In [BKM], the authors state and prove the theorem for the norm $\|\cdot\|$ replaced by sub-multiplicative functions on exterior algebra's of arbitrary finite-dimensional vector spaces. For our purposes, the sup-norm on $\bigwedge(\mathbb{R}^t)$ suffices and this changes the restrictions on ρ slightly, from $\rho \leq 1$ in [BKM] to $\rho \leq \frac{1}{k}$ above. The proof is identical and rather than producing a verbatim repetition, we direct the interested reader to [BKM] and to [KSS] for more results in a similar vein and their applications.

At this stage, we use the fact that we have a Diophantine condition on the coefficients of the hyperplane, namely, (1.1) which tells us that for some $\delta > 0$,

$$(4.1) \quad \max_i |p_i + \alpha_i q| > |q|^{-n+\delta}$$

for every $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, and all but finitely many $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. We now state a Theorem which reduces Claim 2.4 to Theorem 4.4 :

Theorem 4.5. *For every $\epsilon > 0$ and for every $t > 0$,*

$$\inf_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}(\Lambda)} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \|D(\epsilon, t) u_{\mathbf{x}} \Gamma\| \geq \epsilon \cdot \min(C_B^1 2^{\frac{\delta t}{n+1-\delta}}, 2^{(n-1)t} \epsilon^n, C_B^3 2^t \epsilon^{n-1})$$

where $D(\epsilon, t)$ and $u_{\mathbf{x}}$ are as defined before, δ is as in (4.1), Λ is as in Definition 4.3 and C_B^i $i = 1, 3$ are constants depending on B only.

To see that Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5 imply Claim 2.4 consider the following

Proof. We use Theorem 4.4 with $H(\mathbf{x}) = D(\epsilon, t) u_{\mathbf{x}}$, and $\epsilon = \epsilon(t) = 2^{-\beta t}$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$. It now suffices to check that the conditions necessary to apply Theorem 4.4 are satisfied. From Lemma 4.2, it follows that condition 1 is satisfied with $(C, \alpha) = (C_{n-1}, 1)$. As for condition 2, notice that a choice of $\beta < \min(\frac{n-1}{n+1}, \frac{\delta}{n+1-\delta}, \frac{1}{n})$ ensures that

$$\epsilon \cdot \min(C_B^1 2^{\frac{\delta t}{n+1-\delta}}, 2^{(n-1)t} \epsilon^n, C_B^3 2^t \epsilon^{n-1}) \geq 1 \geq \frac{1}{k}.$$

Thus, it follows that :

$$|M^<(B, t, \psi)| < \tilde{C} \frac{\epsilon}{\rho} |B|$$

where $\rho = \frac{1}{k}$ and $\tilde{C} = C_{n-1}k(3^{n-1}N_{n-1})^k$ is a constant depending on n and k only (for details on the constant N_{n-1} , see [KM]). And so,

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} |M^<(B, t, \psi)| < \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon}{\rho} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \max((C_B^1)^{-1} 2^{\frac{-\delta t}{n+1-\delta}}, 2^{-(n-1)t} \epsilon^{-n}, (C_B^3)^{-1} 2^{-t} \epsilon^{-(n-1)})$$

which always converges. Claim 2.4 follows. $\square$

5. THEOREM 4.5

It turns out that obtaining an estimate on $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \|D(\epsilon, t)u_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w}\|$ needs different analysis depending on the rank of the discrete subgroup $\mathbf{w}$ represents.

In what follows, we will denote the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ by $\{\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_{*1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{*(n-1)}, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n\}$, and $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ will denote the subspace : $\{(x_0, 0, \dots, 0, x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid x_i \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq x_i \leq n\} = \mathbb{R}\mathbf{e}_0 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{e}_1 + \dots + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{e}_n$. We divide the analysis into the following cases :

- (1) $\mathbf{w} \in \bigwedge^1(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$.
- (2) $\mathbf{w} \in \bigwedge^{n+1}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$.
- (3) $\mathbf{w} \in \bigwedge^k(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ for $1 < k \leq n$.

The action of $u_{\mathbf{x}}$ on these basis vectors is as follows :

- $u_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{e}_0 = \mathbf{e}_0$.
- $u_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{e}_{*i} = \mathbf{e}_{*i}$.
- $u_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{e}_i = x_i\mathbf{e}_0 + \mathbf{e}_{*i} + \mathbf{e}_i, 1 \leq i \leq n-1$.
- $u_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{e}_n = (\alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i x_i)\mathbf{e}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i \mathbf{e}_{*(i)} + \mathbf{e}_n$.

Case 1. Let $\mathbf{w} \in \bigwedge^1(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ be of the form

$\mathbf{w} = p_0\mathbf{e}_0 + q_1\mathbf{e}_1 + \dots + q_{n-1}\mathbf{e}_{n-1} + q_n\mathbf{e}_n$. Then,

$$D(\epsilon, t)u_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w} = \frac{\epsilon}{2^{-nt}}(p_0 + q_1x_1 + \dots + q_{n-1}x_{n-1} + q_n(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1x_1 + \dots + \alpha_{n-1}x_{n-1}))\mathbf{e}_0 + \epsilon(q_1 + q_n\alpha_1)\mathbf{e}_{*1} + \dots + \epsilon(q_{n-1} + q_n\alpha_{n-1})\mathbf{e}_{*(n-1)} + \frac{\epsilon}{2^t}q_1\mathbf{e}_1 + \dots + \frac{\epsilon}{2^t}q_n\mathbf{e}_n.$$

Recall that we have a Diophantine condition on the coefficients of the hyperplane, namely, (1.1) which tells us that for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\max_i |p_i + \alpha_i q| > |q|^{-n+\delta}$$

for every $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, and all but finitely many $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. This readily implies that for all but finitely many $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, we have

$$(5.1) \quad \max_i |q_i + \alpha_i q_n| > |q_n|^{-n+\delta}$$

The coefficient of $\mathbf{e}_0$ in $D(\epsilon, t)u_{\mathbf{x}}w$ can be written as

$$\frac{\epsilon}{2^{-nt}}(p_0 + q_n \alpha_0 + (q_1 + \alpha_1 q_n)x_1 + \cdots + (q_{n-1} + \alpha_{n-1} q_n)x_{n-1}).$$

From (5.1), we can then deduce that for every $\mathbf{x} \in B$, we have

$$(5.2) \quad \left| \frac{\epsilon}{2^{-nt}}(p_0 + q_n \alpha_0 + (q_1 + \alpha_1 q_n)x_1 + \cdots + (q_{n-1} + \alpha_{n-1} q_n)x_{n-1}) \right| > \frac{\epsilon}{2^{-nt}} C_B |q_n|^{-n+\delta}$$

where C_B is a constant depending on the ball B .

We now turn our attention to the terms $\frac{\epsilon}{2^t} q_i \mathbf{e}_i$ $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Our strategy is to choose a non-zero q_i and then compare the coefficient of $\mathbf{e}_i$, with the term containing q_i in the coefficient of $\mathbf{e}_0$. Due to (5.2), it makes sense to instead consider the equation:

$$(5.3) \quad \frac{\epsilon}{2^{-nt}} C_B y^{-n+\delta} = \frac{\epsilon}{2^t} y.$$

We will denote the unique root of (5.3) by y_0 . So y_0 is in fact, equal to $(C_B)^{\frac{1}{n+1-\delta}} [2^{t(n+1)}]^{\frac{1}{n+1-\delta}}$. From (5.2) and (5.3), it follows that for $w \in \bigwedge^1(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$,

$$(5.4) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \|D(\epsilon, t)u_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w}\| \geq C_B^1 \epsilon \cdot 2^{t(\frac{\delta}{n+1-\delta})}$$

where C_B^1 is a constant depending on B only.

Let us now consider Case 2 i.e.

$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{e}_0 \wedge \mathbf{e}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathbf{e}_n \in \bigwedge^{n+1}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. In this case, $u_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w}$ contains the term $\mathbf{e}_0 \wedge \mathbf{e}_{*1} \wedge \mathbf{e}_{*2} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathbf{e}_{*(n-1)} \wedge \mathbf{e}_n$. Therefore,

$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \|D(\epsilon, t)u_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w}\| \geq 2^{(n-1)t} \cdot \epsilon^{n+1}$, which implies that for $\mathbf{w} \in \bigwedge^{n+1}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$,

$$(5.5) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \|D(\epsilon, t)u_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w}\| > \epsilon \cdot 2^{(n-1)t} \cdot \epsilon^n.$$

Now for Case 3. Here, it is enough to project to the subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ spanned by $\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$. To simplify computations, we instead consider $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and (with some abuse of notation), denote its standard basis by $\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$. For this, we must modify our setup a little. Let $\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}$ denote the matrix :

$$\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{x} & \tilde{\mathbf{x}}A \\ 0 & I_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

In what follows, it will be convenient to change notation slightly. Define functions $\hat{f}_i(\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x} \in B$, in the following manner:

$$\hat{f}_i(\mathbf{x}) = x_i \quad 1 \leq i < n.$$

$$\hat{f}_n(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}A.$$

Further, let $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) = (\hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \hat{f}_n(\mathbf{x}))$. Then, $\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}$ can now be written as:

$$\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) \\ \tilde{0} & I_n \end{pmatrix}$$

Let $\hat{D}(\epsilon, t) = \text{diag}(\frac{\epsilon}{2^{-nt}}, \frac{\epsilon}{2^t}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{2^t})$ where, as before, $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Thus, both $\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\hat{D}(\epsilon, t)$ are matrices in $\text{GL}(n+1, \mathbb{R})$. It therefore suffices to obtain an estimate on

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \|\hat{D}(\epsilon, t)\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w}\| \text{ for any } \mathbf{w} \in \bigwedge^j(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}).$$

Let us write down an expression for $\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{e}_I$.

$\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}$ acts on the basis vectors as follows :

$$(1) \quad \hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{e}_0 = \mathbf{e}_0.$$

$$(2) \quad \hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{e}_i = \hat{f}_i(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{e}_0 + \mathbf{e}_i \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Therefore, for $\mathbf{e}_I = \mathbf{e}_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{e}_{i_j} \in \bigwedge^j(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, we have :

$$\bullet \quad \hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{e}_I = \mathbf{e}_I \text{ if } 0 \in I.$$

$$\bullet \quad \hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{e}_I = \mathbf{e}_I + \sum_{i \in I} (-1)^{l(I,i)} \hat{f}_i(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{e}_{I \cup \{0\} \setminus \{i\}}$$

where $l(I, i)$ = number of elements of I strictly between 0 and i .

Taking $\mathbf{w}$ of the form $\mathbf{w} = \sum_I \mathbf{w}_I \mathbf{e}_I$ we get

$$\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w} = \sum_{0 \in I} (\mathbf{w}_I + \sum_{i \notin I} (-1)^{l(I,i)} \mathbf{w}_{I \cup \{i\} \setminus \{0\}} \hat{f}_i(\mathbf{x})) \mathbf{e}_I + \sum_{0 \notin I} \mathbf{w}_I \mathbf{e}_I.$$

For each $\mathbf{w} = \sum_I \mathbf{w}_I \mathbf{e}_I$, following [K], we define a vector $\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}} = \sum_{i \notin (I \setminus \{0\})} (-1)^{l(I,i)} \mathbf{w}_{I \cup \{i\} \setminus \{0\}}.$$

Then, the non-constant components of $\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w}$ can be written as $(1, \hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2, \dots, \hat{f}_n) \mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}$.

Let P be the augmented $(n, n+1)$ matrix given by $(I_n | A)$. Then, we can write

$$(1, \hat{f}_1, \dots, \hat{f}_n) = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}P.$$

Therefore, the nonconstant components of $\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w}$ can now be written as $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}P\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}$.

We can thus replace $\|\hat{D}(\epsilon, t)\hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{w}\|$ by

$$(5.6) \quad C_B^3 \max(\epsilon^j 2^{t(n+1-j)} \max_{0 \in I} \|P\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}\|, \epsilon^j 2^{-jt} \max_{0 \notin I} |\mathbf{w}_I|)$$

where C_B^3 is a constant depending on B alone.

At this stage, it is advantageous to split the vector $\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}$ into components, $\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^+ \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^- \in \mathbb{R}$ (which respectively denote first n rows of the column vector $\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}$ and its last row). And so we can write :

$$\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^+ \\ \mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^- \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^+ = \mathbf{w}_I \mathbf{e}_0 + \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \setminus I} (-1)^{l(I,i)} \mathbf{w}_{I \cup \{i\} \setminus \{0\}} \mathbf{e}_i$ and $\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^- = (-1)^{l(I,n)} \mathbf{w}_{I \cup \{n\} \setminus \{0\}}$ if $n \notin I$ and 0 otherwise.

Therefore, $P\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^+ + A\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^-)$, and it follows that :

$$(5.7) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \|\hat{D}(\epsilon, t) \hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{w}\| \geq C_B^3 \{ \epsilon^j 2^{t(n+1-j)} \max_{0 \in I} \|\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^+ + A\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^-\|, \epsilon^j 2^{-jt} \max_{0 \notin I} |\mathbf{w}_I| \}$$

where C_B^3 is as in (5.6). The stage is now set for Lemma 4.5 from [K] which tells us that:

Lemma 5.1. [K] *For any $\mathbf{w} \in \bigwedge^j(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, we have :*

$$\max_{0 \in I} \|\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^+ + A\mathbf{c}_{I,\mathbf{w}}^-\| \geq 1.$$

From (5.6), (5.7) and Lemma 5.1, it follows that:

$$(5.8) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \|\hat{D}(\epsilon, t) \hat{u}_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{w}\| \geq C_B^3 2^{t(n-j+1)} \cdot \epsilon^j \geq C_B^3 \cdot \epsilon \cdot 2^t \cdot \epsilon^{n-1}.$$

From (5.4), (5.5) and (5.8), it follows that for any $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}(\Lambda)$, we have

$$\|D(\epsilon, t) u_{\mathbf{x}} \Gamma\| \geq \epsilon \cdot \min(C_B^1 2^{\frac{\delta t}{n+1-\delta}}, 2^{(n-1)t} \epsilon^n, C_B^3 2^t \epsilon^{n-1}).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.5 and hence the proof of Claim 2.4. $\square$

6. CONCLUSION AND OPEN QUESTIONS

As we have mentioned, in [BKM], the authors have obtained a Khintchine type theorem for non-degenerate manifolds of any codimension. Moreover, [BBDD] treats the case of a straight line passing through the origin. We could thus hope to complete the picture and prove a theorem similar to Theorem 1.6 for affine subspaces of arbitrary codimension. Following [K], it would also be nice to establish a Khintchine theorem for non-degenerate submanifolds of affine subspaces. This will be dealt with in a forthcoming paper, where we also establish the multiplicative analogue of the convergence Khintchine theorem.

It would also be of interest to check if the Diophantine condition given in this paper is optimal. More conjectures along these lines can be found in [K].

Acknowledgements. The author thanks his advisor Dmitry Kleinbock for suggesting the problem, for constant encouragement and for numerous helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [BBDD] V.Beresnevich, V.Bernik, H.Dickinson and M.M.Dodson, *On linear manifolds for which the Khintchin approximation theorem holds*. Vestsi Acad Navuk Belarusi.Ser.Fiz.-Mat. Navuk (2000), 14 – 17 (Belorussian).
- [BBKM] V.Beresnevich, V.Bernik, D.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis, *Metric Diophantine approximation: the Khintchine-Groshev theorem for non-degenerate manifolds*, Moscow Math.J.2 (2002),no.2, 203 – 225.
- [BD] V.Bernik and M.M.Dodson, *Metric Diophantine Approximation on Manifolds*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics No.137, CUP, (1999).
- [BKM] V.Bernik, D.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis, *Khintchine type theorems on manifolds : the convergence case for the standard and multiplicative versions*. Internat.Math.Res.Notices (2001), No.9, 453 – 486.
- [D1] M.M.Dodson, *Geometrical and Probabilistic ideas in Metric Diophantine Approximation*, Usp.Mat.Nauk 48, (1993), 77 – 106. Also in Russian Math Surveys 48, (1993), 23 – 29.
- [D2] M.M.Dodson, *Hausdorff dimension, lower order and Khintchine’s theorem in metric Diophantine approximation*. J.Reine Angew.Math 432 (1992), 69–76.
- [DD] H.Dickinson and M.M.Dodson, *Extremal manifolds and Hausdorff dimension*. Duke Mathematical Journal (2000), Vol 101 No.2, 271 – 281.
- [H] G.Harman, *Metric Number theory*. London Mathematical Society Monographs, New Series 18.
- [K] D.Kleinbock, *Extremal subspaces and their submanifolds*. Geom.Funct.Anal 13, (2003), no 2, 437 – 466 .
- [KM] D.Kleinbock and G.A.Margulis, *Flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine Approximation on Manifolds*. Ann Math 148 (1998), 339 – 360.
- [KSS] D.Kleinbock, N.Shah and A.Starkov, *Dynamics of subgroup actions on homogeneous spaces of Lie groups and applications to number theory*, in Handbook on Dynamical Systems, Volume 1A, Elsevier Science, North Holland, 2002, 813 – 930.
- [S] W.Schmidt, *Diophantine Approximation*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1980.

Anish Ghosh
MS 050, Brandeis University

Waltham, MA-02454
U.S.A.
ghosh@brandeis.edu